



No 426 H. 77



10-21-32

INVASION OF HARPER'S FERRY--DANGERS AND DUTIES
OF THE SOUTH.

REMARKS

OF

SENATORS CLAY OF ALABAMA, GWIN
OF CALIFORNIA, AND OTHERS,

DELIVERED

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES, DECEMBER 13, 1859.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the following resolution, submitted by Mr. MASON, on the 5th of December:

Resolved, That a committee be appointed to inquire into the facts attending the late invasion and seizure of the armory and arsenal of the United States at Harper's Ferry, in Virginia, by a band of armed men, and report whether the same was attended by armed resistance to the authorities and public force of the United States, and by the murder of any of the citizens of Virginia, or of any troops sent there to protect the public property; whether such invasion and seizure was made under color of any organization intended to subvert the government of any of the States of the Union; what was the character and extent of such organization; and whether any citizens of the United States, not present, were implicated therein or accessory thereto by contributions of money, arms, munitions, or otherwise; what was the character and extent of the military equipment in the hands, or under the control, of said armed band, and where and how and when the same was obtained and transported to the place so invaded. And that said committee report whether any and what legislation may, in their opinion, be necessary, on the part of the United States, for the future preservation of the peace of the country, or for the safety of the public property; and that said committee have power to send for persons and papers.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin, [Mr. DOOLITTLE,] in the remarks which he submitted to the Senate the other day, used this language:

"I agree, Mr. President, that the time has come when we should understand each other, and understand each other fully and distinctly; when there should be no concealments, when we should make a clean breast of the whole matter, and learn how we stand upon this floor."

In that sentiment I fully and cordially concur; and, to ascertain where we stand, reluctantly rise this morning with the purpose of addressing the Senate, in the spirit of courtesy and of candor. I wish to know how we stand, and, endeavoring to suppress any feeling of bitterness or of indignation, which recent events and some of the debate in this Senate might justly excite in any southern breast, shall, at the same time, speak with frankness, impartiality, and truth. I trust that I shall be heard with patience, and be answered with frankness, for I wish to know where we stand.

Northern Senators, on the other side of the Chamber, profess to respect, and declare that they will observe and maintain, all the constitutional rights of the South. If you be sincere in this declaration, if your party intend to keep this pledge,

there is no cause of difference between us, and we may remain, until the final trump shall sound, brethren and equals in this Confederacy. But pardon me if I mistrust your pledges. While you may think that such is the spirit and such the tendency of the principles and sentiments which you avow, we regard them in a far different light. I think that the manner and tone of this debate negatives this profession of friendship and fellowship, of respect and regard for our constitutional rights.

What have we heard upon this floor? One Senator treats the late murderous foray upon Virginia with a levity which would be insulting to us if it came from any other than one who seems to regard all things as a joke, and who probably will die, like Rabelais, with a jest upon his lips, and never realize the responsibilities of life or of death until he is called to judgment. Another ridicules the cowardice, the weakness, the impotence of the South in suffering a handful of men to seize the arsenal, and to defy a town of fifteen hundred or more inhabitants. Another entertains us with his newly-discovered revelations of the opinions of Washington, Jefferson, and other fathers of the Union, and framers of the Declaration of Independence and the Federal Constitution, disapproving of slavery. Another endeavors to excite domestic dissension and discord within our own ranks in the South, by appealing to non-slaveholders to come up to the support of the Republican party, professing to vindicate their rights, and to rescue them from the curse of slavery and the oppression of slaveholders; thus striving to scatter dragon's teeth over the plains of the South, in the hope, it would seem, that there will spring up armed men ready to destroy our domestic institutions, to desolate our fields, and to drench our hearthstones in fraternal blood. Others, with frightful manner, and with fierce and brave words, threaten us with coercion if we refuse to submit to their authority, no matter how ever tyrannical, unconstitutional, and oppressive.

These are the evidences of fraternal affection and of respect for the South which you tender!

Mr. President, Wendell Phillips has said, I think truly said--speaking of this foray upon

7 Nov 44 24. 28

11/722

Jan. 31/871

Virginia—that it is the natural result of anti-slavery teaching. For one, I accept it; I expected it; I admire his courage and his candor. Like another co-sar, he shuns no question, and he wears no mask. He speaks his whole mind; and the real feeling of his heart. He indulges in no diplomatic or Delphic language, but speaks in plain Anglo-Saxon what he thinks and feels; and for this I applaud him and approve his conduct.

I may claim somewhat of prophetic ken for an opinion expressed on this floor, now near four years since. I said that the natural and necessary result of the anti-slavery teachings of the Republican party was civil strife and bloodshed, and that it would occur if that party prevailed in the North. I spoke it under a solemn sense of responsibility to my State and to the Union. I believed it. My opinions have proven prophecies, and have been realized at Harper's Ferry. How could it be otherwise? I submit to Senators whether they ought to expect to teach their constituencies to hate slaveholding and slaveholders, and yet to restrain them from any violation of our rights? When you teach them that slavery is a crime against man and a sin in the eyes of Heaven, and has no guarantee in the Federal Constitution, how can you expect men to respect our rights or to refrain from acts of violence and of injury? The principles you profess, the sentiments you avow, the very platform read in our hearing, bind you, as honest men, to exert every means within your power to abolish slavery, not only within exclusive Federal jurisdiction, but within the States in which it exists.

Governor Chase, of Ohio, expressed to a citizen of my State and a resident of the town in which I live, what I do sincerely believe is the general sentiment of the Republican party. The Rev. William D. Chadick, a gentleman, a scholar, and a Christian, the presiding pastor of a Presbyterian church in my town, who never desecrated the pulpit by political discourses, but has proven himself a man of pure piety and peace, says, in a letter to an editor of a newspaper in that town, that, in a conversation with Governor Chase, during the winter of 1857, at Cincinnati, where he had gone to ascertain where he could colonize some forty or more slaves manumitted by a citizen of Alabama, that Governor Chase closed his remarks by saying with emphasis, that—

“For his part, he would rather never see another free negro set his foot upon Ohio soil.” I asked his reason. “Because,” said he, “their moral influence is degrading.” I then remarked, that it appeared to me a glaring inconsistency in him and others in Ohio, to love our southern slaves so much as to desire their freedom and clamor for their emancipation, and yet hate them so much as to be unwilling to allow them a home in their own State; especially so, since, by the existing laws in the slave States, the negro cannot be liberated and remain where he is. He replied: “I do not wish the slave emancipated because I love him, but because I hate his master—I hate slavery—I hate a man that will own a slave.”

Such, Mr. President, I sincerely believe is the common sentiment of the Republican party; such has been, substantially, the language of other Senators who have sat upon this floor, or, at least, the sentiment avowed by them. I do not doubt that Governor Chase said it, because I know Mr. Chadick to be a man above suspicion and without reproach, who never violates the commandments or dishonors the cause of the Prince of Peace, whom he professes to follow. And yet

I will say that, from my acquaintance with Governor Chase, while he was a Senator upon this floor, I was persuaded that he was among the last men of that party who would entertain feelings so rancorous, or indulge in their expression in such decided and bitter terms; for he is a scholar of highly cultivated intellect and refined feelings, whose deportment here was that of an affable, amiable, and philanthropic man. His colleague, in former days, who now sits upon this floor, has uttered substantially the same sentiment.

Mr. WADE. Does the Senator refer to me?

Mr. CLAY. I do refer to you, sir.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. CLAY. I will, most assuredly.

Mr. WADE. I only wish the Senator to give my language, and the time and place when such a sentiment was uttered, that is all. I think he is mistaken about it.

Mr. CLAY. I will do so. If the Senator is not misreported in a speech delivered in the State of Maine, in the summer of 1855, he declared that the North and the South hated each other as cordially as the English and the Russians. I do not pretend to quote his exact language, but I did so in his presence in 1856, and he did not question the correctness of my recital. His sentiment was that as cordial hatred existed between the North and the South as between the English and the Russians, who were then carrying on war in the Crimea against each other.

The same sentiment has been often avowed in different language, by the distinguished Senator from New York, [Mr. SEWARD,] not now in his seat; and I feel no compunction or hesitation in referring to his remarks or criticising them, because I have done so in his presence, and he did not deny the correctness of my quotation or dissent from the construction which I placed on his language. He has denounced, throughout the State of New York, the slaveholders of this country, in language not so coarse but quite as harsh as that used by the Senator from Ohio who sits before me. The Senator from Ohio has characterized us as Vandals who had stolen northern rights. A Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SUMNER] denounced us as robbers, and declared that—

“There is no vileness of dishonesty, no denial of human rights, that is not plainly involved in the support of slavery.”

The Senator from Ohio declared, that—

“Slavery, founded in violence, must always be aggressive; and the moment it ceases to be aggressive, it ceases to be at all. That is its very life; its being is outrage.”

The Senator from New York denounced us as a “perfidious privileged class,” and charged us with fraud, perfidy, and dishonesty.

Now, sir, I could multiply quotations of similar sentiments from others who sit on this floor, or have sat here, and from distinguished Representatives of that party in the other end of this Capitol. But we are told that these men do not express the sentiments of the Republican party, and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. TRUMBULL] denies that they have the right to speak for that party. These sentiments were uttered previous to the elections of these distinguished men to the Senate of the United States or to the House of Representatives; and do they think we are so

stupid, and so ignorant of the character of our institutions, as to be persuaded that those elected to high offices do not reflect the feelings and opinions of the electors?

In this country, office-holders are generally the expositors and advocates of principles and sentiments which they know are congenial to the minds and hearts of the people who elect them. Hence I presume that those men spoke what the party whom they represent thought and felt; and therefore say that the Republican party cordially hate slaveholding and slaveholders. In saying this I intend no personal disrespect. I hate crime and criminals, acknowledge no fellowship with those who commit a felon's acts and deserve a felon's fate, and do not feel that apology is due to anybody for this declaration. It is not incumbent upon those who regard slaveholding as a crime and slaveholders as criminals, to offer any apology or endeavor to excuse themselves for their hatred of us and avowal of it before the world.

I might quote, from northern Republicans, expressions of hatred, abhorrence, and loathing of us, until the list stretched to the length of the calendar of saints, but will forbear, because this is not pleasant to me, and may not be instructive or entertaining to the other side of the Senate, who doubtless have heard, and know much more, than any southern man can tell.

But your hatred for our institutions and for us is disclosed in the very platform which was jeeringly read in our hearing by the Senator from Illinois, in which you denounce slavery as a "twin relic of barbarism" with polygamy. Polygamy is not only in your and our estimation an unchristian, heathenish, and barbarous practice, but a violation of the revealed will of God, of natural law, and of the rights, interests, and duties of humanity. It is not merely a sin, but is, also, a crime. Your laws and our laws, and the laws of all Christian States, punish it as a crime. You denounce slavery equally as a sin and a crime, and would, no doubt, proscribe and punish it if you had the power.

Furthermore, your platform declares that the negro is entitled to liberty and equality with the white man in social and political rights. Do I misinterpret it? If so, correct me. I so understand it, and many of your northern States illustrate it in their acts of legislation. In the State of Massachusetts, for instance, you accord the negro the elective franchise, enroll him in the militia, and admit him to every other civil and political right which the white man can enjoy—ay, you grant him even by law the privilege of intermarriage with the white race. Does the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Wilson] condemn this? Will he say, in the presence of the American Senate, that his Legislature has erred, or that his party has, in conferring on the negro all the civil rights, privileges, and immunities of the white man, especially in authorizing amalgamation by intermarriage? If so, I will with pleasure yield him the floor. He declines to do it; and hence it must be inferred that he approves the entire equality, maintained by the statutes of his State, between the negro and the white races, even to the extent of commingling their blood by lawful marriage. The State of New Hampshire is but little, if any, behind Massachusetts, and I should propound similar questions to her representatives

if they were present. Indeed, there are, if I am not misinformed, but few of the northern States in which you have not, by special legislation, admitted the negro to all, or nearly all, the rights and privileges of the white man.

Therefore, I repeat, that you maintain by your platform, and illustrate by your legislation, your belief that the negro is the equal of the white man in social and political rights, and that all disparaging distinctions by legal enactment between the two should be obliterated. You thus make a chasm between the North and the South so deep and wide that it can never be filled up or bridged over. You cannot pass it without sacrificing your principles or denying your faith. We cannot pass it without denying our faith and sacrificing our country. Hence, we can never stand together. Hence, we can never submit to your domination until we are prepared to pass beneath the yoke, and surrender all that is dear to us in the present or in the future.

You show your hatred of slaveholding and of slaveholders, in other ways, by your non-action of legislation as well as by your action. For twenty-five years past, our negroes have been stolen or robbed from us, either by individuals or by organized bands of predatory northern invaders. Tell me, northern Senators, what non-slaveholding State has ever, by any act of legislation, provided for the punishment of these depredations upon our property, or for the suppression and prevention of such offenses? Is there one? If there be one, I should be glad to hear it. My friend on my right [Mr. Green] says that the State of Illinois did it; but I ask him whether it was not the act of a Democratic Legislature?

Mr. GREEN. Yes.

Mr. CLAY. I knew it must be.

Mr. GWIN. I will state to the Senator from Alabama that California, year after year, has passed a fugitive slave law—a local law.

Mr. CLAY. I repeat to my friend the same question: Was it not the act of a Democratic Legislature?

Mr. GWIN. Of course it was, for we never have any other.

Mr. CLAY. Of course it was; but nowhere, in any non-slaveholding State of this Union, except where the Democratic party have prevailed, and while they have controlled legislation, has any act been passed to suppress the thieving and robbery which have been carried on upon the slave property of the South. Thus, you have countenanced the robbery of our property and violation of our rights; you have encouraged it by your non-action. In vain we have complained; we have remonstrated; we have invoked you, as brethren, living under a common Constitution, in the bond of a common Union, and professedly devoted to the same common destiny, to discharge your solemn obligations—obligations devolved on you by the comity of confederate friendly States—devolved on you by the solemn injunctions of the Federal Constitution—obligations which you are adjured by a solemn oath to carry out and maintain.

Suppose I paused here and went no further, might I not truly say that the sentiment of Governor Chase is illustrated by the practice of the party to which you belong? Where is the Senator of the Republican party, who, in his place, will get up and say that he thinks it is the duty of the

Legislature of the State which he represents, by legislation, to prevent these predatory incursions into southern States, and the kidnapping, stealing, and running off of our slaves? Where is one who condemns it, and will say that his State ought to suppress these unfriendly and hostile acts? I pause for a reply. Not one. All would encourage these depredations upon our property, at least by non-action. All admit, by their silence, that their Legislatures are right to discountenance, to discourage, and to destroy that institution, as far as they dare do.

But your Legislatures have not been content, by inaction, to countenance these depredations upon our rights and our property. You have actually encouraged them by positive legislation. The State of Massachusetts, under Republican administration, has passed an act for the purpose of nullifying the fugitive slave law. She disfranchises the lawyer who there appears for the claimant of a fugitive slave. She threatens the judge who dares try any such cause with impeachment. She punishes ignominiously, as well as by fine, the jailor or other officer who assists in the seizure or the restoration of a fugitive slave. She menaces with ignominious punishment all ministerial or military officers who aid in enforcing that law. No doubt she does it with the approbation of the Senators from Massachusetts. If not, let them now speak. It is not denied, and I take it for granted that they approve of this legislation.

Well, similar acts have been passed in New Hampshire, Vermont, Rhode Island, Maine, New York, Michigan, Wisconsin, and, doubtless, in other States whose legislation I have not had time to review. All of those have nullified, so far as they could do, the fugitive slave law of 1850, and have provided for punishing as a crime the execution, or aiding or abetting in the execution, of that act. Will not one Senator from either of those States declare, in the presence of the American Senate, and proclaim to the American people, his disapproval of those acts? Will none here admit that they are, as they certainly are, gross infractions of the Federal Constitution and inexcusable abuses of rights solemnly guaranteed by that instrument to the South? I pause for a reply. Not one! And yet you proclaim in our hearing, boldly, and with apparent frankness and sincerity, that your party tries and intends to observe and maintain all the constitutional rights of the South. Can you make us believe it in the face of these acts? Do you think you can persuade us to credit your assertions, when I ask you here to condemn, to disapprove, in any terms you may please, these acts of your Legislatures, and you sit mute, and, by your silence, acknowledge that they express your principles and your sentiments? Where is the Senator on that side of the Chamber, who, if summoned by a legally authorized officer of the Government, either State or Federal, to assist in the recapture or the rendition of a fugitive slave, would do so? I venture to say there is not one—not one. Yea, your Legislatures have gone even further. The Legislature of Michigan has made it a penal offense to carry a slave within the limits of that State, and I believe the same is true of the State of New Hampshire. Yet the Senator from Michigan, [Mr. CHANDLER,] the other day, protested that he was in favor of observing all the obligations of the Federal Constitution. I ask

him to say whether he condemns the action of the party to which he belongs in the Legislature of Michigan, within a few years past, by which they have nullified the fugitive slave act and rendered it a penal offense to carry a slave even within the limits of the State. He says nothing. He admits, by his silence, his approbation of this legislation.

The Senator from Wisconsin tells us, speaking for his party, that:

"As I understand it, we stand here as equals and brethren, the representatives of equal and sovereign States, bound to maintain the Government of the United States, the Constitution of the United States, and the laws of the United States which are enacted in pursuance of the Constitution. As individual members of the Senate, we are bound, by our oath to the Constitution of the United States, to maintain that Constitution, and to maintain the laws which are enacted in pursuance of it, and to maintain them at all hazards and against all enemies, no matter whether they come from abroad or whether they exist at home."

And, notwithstanding I show him that the members of his party are the enemies of that Constitution, and the violators of the laws of the United States—that they have violated them under the solemn adjuration of an oath to support them, by their legislation—he, by his silence, approves these violations. He does not dare get up and rebuke his party. He does not dare, with all his professed devotion to the Union and the Constitution, to raise his voice in their behalf.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. CLAY. Certainly.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. I desire not to enter now into a discussion of the question, but simply to state to the honorable Senator from Alabama that the Constitution of the United States, construed properly, gives to the Congress of the United States no power to pass a fugitive slave law. The Constitution of the United States simply inhibits the States from discharging from service the fugitive who may be held by the laws of the State from which he escapes. I shall not now enter into the discussion; but at a proper time and on a proper occasion, I am willing to do so.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. President, I shall enter into no constitutional argument with the Senator respecting the fugitive slave act of 1850, or that of 1793; but his Legislature has never passed any act for the rendition of fugitive slaves, and will the Senator say here that he would advise his Legislature, in the absence of any congressional legislation upon the subject, to pass a law for the punishment of stealing or robbery of our negroes, and providing for their rendition? Would he advise his party and the people of the State he represents, to pass such an act? He, too, is silent. He would not do it. What a bare mockery of our rights, what a sheer pretense of regard for your constitutional obligations, to tell us that you will violate the fugitive slave law because you do not regard it as constitutional, and yet, at the same time, admit that you will pass no act by your State Legislatures to maintain that Constitution and to vindicate our rights, solemnly guaranteed by your fathers and ours in that instrument!

Thus I show that, by your avowed sentiments, by your professed principles, and by the acts of your party, wherever you have obtained power within your States, you evince your hatred of slaveholding and slaveholders. Why should you get up and express your abhorrence of the crime

of John Brown? Why should you endeavor to exculpate your party from any complicity, either in act or in intention or in principle, with John Brown, when, on the platform which you flaunt in bitter mockery and railery in our faces, you denounce the institution of slavery as a crime deserving the execration of all Christian and civilized people? Would you receive Brigham Young and his followers as your equals in social life? Do you think that he is entitled even to the civilities and courtesies that are due between gentlemen? You cannot say that you do; and yet you damn us to everlasting infamy, together with him, by your platform, which you avow is the exponent of the principles of your party. I repeat, then, how can you expect us to affiliate with you, or to feel any of that fraternal love which is the spirit of this Union, and without which it cannot long exist, when you proclaim to the world, without hesitation, your abhorrence of our institutions and your hatred of us? Do you think that we are more or less than men; that we are devoid of the sensibilities of human nature; that we have no pride of honor, no pride of State, no pride of ancestry? If you do not, why mock us with your professions of fraternal love and respect, and chide us for not reciprocating those sentiments?

The root of all this evil is in the antagonism of principle and sentiment that cannot be reconciled if you speak what you mean and believe. You proclaim by your platform and maintain by your legislation the equality of the negro with the white man in social and political rights. You never can impress the non-slaveholders of the South with that idea. They do not, and never can, believe that the negro is the equal of the white man. They know that he is not their equal by nature, and was not made or declared their equal by the Constitution of the United States. They believe that slavery is the normal condition of the negro. They have unanswerable reasons for that belief. The history of the aboriginal negro in Africa, of the freed negro in the West Indies, in Liberia, in your own States, as well as in ours, attests the correctness of this opinion. Look at your own statistics; look at the records of your poor-houses and prison-houses, and what do they establish? That free-negrodism is the synonym of poverty, destitution, pauperism, viciousness, crime, disease, and death!

I repeat, the root of the evil is your assertion of the equality of the negro with the white man. The fruits of it are your platform pledge to prohibit slavery in the Territories of the United States. You promise to go no further in your platform; but the logical and necessary sequence of that pledge and the principles you avow is to prohibit slavery wherever the Federal Government has exclusive jurisdiction—whenever you get the power. There is not a Senator, except, perhaps, the Senator from Illinois, who spoke the other day, who belongs to the Republican party, who will say here, in our presence, that if he had the power in both Houses of Congress, and by the aid of the chief executive of his party, he would not favor passing an act abolishing slavery in the Territories, if it existed there, and prohibiting slavery in all the Territories of the United States. If there is one, let him now speak. Not one of you but is pledged by your platform to prohibit and abolish slavery in all the Territories of the United

States. Such was your avowed purpose in the canvass of 1856; and such is your purpose this day, although you may not avow it. You proclaim that it is not only the right, but that it is the duty of Congress, to prohibit in the Territories "those twin relics of barbarism, polygamy and slavery." Now, I submit, if you feel bound by your respect for the laws of God, which are violated, as you allege, by the institution of slavery, by your respect for the Federal Constitution, which you swore to support—the primary object and ulterior design of which you say was to secure liberty to all men within exclusive Federal jurisdiction—how can you escape the obligation, or neglect your duty to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, whenever you can get the power? Many of you have declared a purpose to do so; and your great leader, Mr. SEWARD, has once offered a bill to carry out that purpose.

Is there one of you who will say that Congress possesses greater power over the Territories of the United States than over the District of Columbia? Not one, I presume. Why are you not equally pledged to abolish it in all the forts, arsenals, dockyards—wherever the Federal flag floats and excludes State jurisdiction? If faithful to the principles you profess, if you would carry them out to their logical and necessary result, you must do it. How could you, in view of this platform, give any countenance or protection to slavery upon the high seas? Suppose a vessel filled with negroes from the port of Charleston should sail for the port of Galveston, in Texas, and it should be seized by a British or French man-of-war, and all the slaves should be confiscated, is there one of you who would, as a last resort, redress our wrongs by war? Is there one who would be willing even to claim and insist on recompense for our property through our foreign minister at either of those courts? I pause for a reply. Not one! We have instances to attest that your party will not seek indemnity for our losses of such property anywhere, of any State or nation, under any circumstances.

Well, Senators, what does this all illustrate and evidence? That the declaration of Governor Chase is a frank though perhaps impolitic avowal of the common sentiment of your party, that you hate slaveholding and slaveholders, and that so intense and bitter is your hatred that you will not observe the solemn obligations of the Constitution to protect their property and maintain their constitutional rights. Then, if your party obtain power, and you can control the legislation of this Government by a dominant majority in the House of Representatives and Senate, and by a chief executive officer, what are we of the South to expect? Why, that you will pronounce sentence of outlawry against slaveholders wherever they go beyond the limits of the slaveholding States; that if they dare venture upon the high seas, in a non-slaveholding State, in the Territories, in the District of Columbia, in any fort, arsenal, or dockyard in the United States, it must be at the peril of their property and their lives. You condemn them to eternal quarantine within the limits of the slaveholding States. And what is your purpose in doing this?

The Senator from Vermont, [Mr. COLLAMER,] whom I respect for his intelligence, his personal integrity, and his high bearing, avowed what that

purpose is—and it has been declared by other Senators of your party—when he said that the policy of the northern people, in inhibiting the spread of slavery in the Territories, was its ultimate extermination. To quote his exact language, he said the northern people believe “that the more it is circumscribed the less is it productive, and the sooner will be emancipation.” Then, forewarned as we are that the purpose of your party is the ultimate extermination of slavery—

Mr. COLLAMER. Will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. CLAY. Certainly.

Mr. COLLAMER. I take it the gentleman understands, from the very terms which he has quoted as being mine, that emancipation would be the act of the southern people themselves.

Mr. CLAY. Exactly.

Mr. COLLAMER. Not that we desire emancipation in any other way than by the act of the people who are themselves the owners of the slaves.

Mr. CLAY. I read what the Senator said.

Now, the Senator disclaims, and I believe he honestly and sincerely disclaims *for himself*, any purpose to assail that institution within the States by an attempt to abolish slavery by congressional act. I acquit him of any such purpose as that.

Mr. COLLAMER. It certainly implies nothing of that kind—nothing but emancipation by the masters themselves, like manumission, sending it from the hand.

Mr. CLAY. But the idea announced by the Senator, and expressed in the speech from which I have quoted, is that if you will circumscribe slavery and confine it within narrow limits, by the increase of that people the time must soon arrive when they will cease to be a source of profit to the master, and when they will be a tax upon him; and he will, therefore, be constrained, in self-defense, to emancipate his slaves. That is their mode of achieving the same object which is avowed by the Abolitionists, and the only difference between them is in the manner of the act. Both have the same will and purpose. The one goes to it directly by trampling on the Constitution, and by exerting all the powers of the Federal Government to effect it; the other proposes only to abuse and pervert those Federal powers, by excluding us from the Territories of the United States, and thereby indirectly accomplish what your radical Abolitionist would do directly and undisguisedly.

Now, the South is told, “we will not respect your constitutional rights; we intend to violate them; we intend, whenever a slave escapes from your limits, to secure him his liberty; we will encourage non-action on the part of our Legislatures to suppress any forays within your limits, of thieves, robbers, and murderers; we will encourage acts of nullification of the Federal fugitive slave law; we will not give you protection upon the high seas, in the Territories, in the District of Columbia, anywhere within exclusive Federal jurisdiction; we sentence you to outlawry if you go beyond the limits of your own States; we condemn you to perpetual quarantine there; we regard you as lepers whose touch is pollution and whose embrace is death; we regard you as criminals whom we should abhor and condemn;” and then we are asked, “Why should the South complain of us; why should she reproach us with hos-

tile designs against her institutions; why should she threaten secession in the event of the election of a Republican President?” Is it not manifest to all, who are not willfully blind, or entirely insensible to all the duties of a man who knows his rights, and, knowing, dare maintain, that they mock us with that question? Do you suppose that we intend to bow our necks to the yoke; that we intend to submit to the domination of our enemies; that we intend to sit here in your presence as hostages for the good behavior of our conquered people—a people who will be under your administration, not as sovereigns to rule, but as subjects to be governed? Surely, you must entertain a more contemptuous opinion of us than you have even expressed in this platform, if you think we can ever submit to that last degradation. There are men, I rejoice to say, within your own limits, not only of the Democratic party of the North, but of the old Whig party, who appreciate our rights, who esteem our virtues, who respect our honor, more than you profess to do. Millard Fillmore was one, and he spoke, I trust, the sentiment of the freemen of the South when he said that we would never submit to be governed by a Republican President, elected by a sectional majority. Said he, in his Albany speech, in 1856:

“Can it be possible that those who are engaged in such a measure can have seriously reflected upon the consequences which must inevitably follow in case of success? Can they have the madness or the folly to believe that our southern brethren would submit to be governed by such a Chief Magistrate?”

I rise here to indulge in no menace. We have been menaced, during this Congress and often before, by members of your party, with the halter and the hangman, if we dare resist your authority and refuse to submit to subjugation. I know that those who are foremost to threaten are generally hindmost to execute. I never have uttered, and never will utter, any menace. I make no predictions, no promise for my State; but, in conclusion, will only say, that if she is faithful to the pledges she has made and principles she has professed; if she is true to her own interest and her own honor; if she is not recreant to all that State pride, integrity, and duty demands, she will never submit to your authority. I will add, that unless she, and all the southern States of this Union, with, perhaps, but two, or at most, three exceptions, are not faithless to the pledges they have given, they will never submit to the government of a President professing your political faith and elected by your sectional majority. You remember that, after the adoption of the compromise measures, in 1850, Georgia led the van in declaring that, upon the happening of either of certain events, she would disrupt the ties that bind her to the Union. Those contingencies were the refusal to admit a State into this Union because it was slaveholding, or recognized the right to hold slaves; any repeal or modification of the fugitive slave law; any attempt to abolish the inter-State slave trade; any prohibition of slavery in the Territories of the United States, or the abolition of slavery in this District, or any place subject to the jurisdiction of Congress. Every southern State but two, or at most three, by the unanimous resolve of their Legislatures, the unanimous resolve of State conventions, both Democratic and Whig, and, latterly, American, have pledged themselves to maintain those resolutions, and to

dissolve this Union, if they possess the power, upon the happening of either of these contingencies.

Now, I submit whether there would not be much stronger cause, on the part of the southern people, for separation, upon the election of a President of a party pledged by their platform to carry out all these measures. A bare majority of Congress might not faithfully express the will of the people. It might be said, in deprecation of any extreme action on the part of the South or of any of the southern States, "Wait; let us appeal from the servants to their masters—from Congress to the people of the North—and see whether they approve of this unjust and iniquitous legislation." But, when the people themselves, at the ballot-box, deliberately avow a purpose, on the part of the North, to exclude us from all the Territories of the United States, by abolishing slavery therein or prohibiting it therein; to refuse to keep that bond of the Federal Constitution which pledges you to return the slave upon demand of his master; to abolish slavery within the District of Columbia, and wherever the Federal flag floats, I ask you whether we would not be either insensible of our rights or indifferent to their maintenance, or unworthy of them, if we quietly and peaceably submitted to the inauguration of your President?

Mr. President, I forbear to say more. I trust now that the country, or at least that section of it from which I come, will be fairly forewarned of the fact that the Republican party is hostile in principle and sentiment to slaveholders and slaveholding; and that they are pledged, by their platforms and their legislative acts, in most of the northern States, to war upon the South, by encouraging the destruction of our property in slaves, by forcing on us emancipation of them; by abolishing slavery wherever Federal prevails over State jurisdiction—in Territories, this District, arsenals, navy-yards, dockyards, and the high seas. I trust, sir, that the constituency whom I have the honor to represent, being thus forewarned, will prove themselves forearmed whenever the time of trial which is threatened shall arrive.

Mr. GWIN. Mr. President, it was not my purpose to address the Senate on this question at all, but the speech of the Senator from Alabama strikes me as a warning, such as has never been given in the Senate of the United States before. I believe that that Senator has expressed the opinion of a vast majority of the people of the slaveholding States of this Confederacy. I believe he has stated here to-day what will inevitably be the action of those States in the event of the election of a Republican candidate to the office of President of the United States. Entertaining this opinion, I should be faithless to the trust that has been reposed in me as a representative of one of the sovereign States of the Confederation, whose people are unanimously in favor of this Union and its preservation, if I did not add my voice of warning at this particular juncture, which is fraught, in my judgment, with extreme peril.

Mr. President, there is a great mistake existing in the non-slaveholding States of the Confederacy in regard to the public sentiment of the South. They seem to entertain the delusion that there is no serious idea in the southern States to separate from the non-slaveholding States in the event of the election of a Republican candidate for the Presidency. I believe, not only that such is the

sentiment and determination of a vast majority of the inhabitants of the slaveholding States now, but that it will be nearly a unanimous sentiment in the event of such an election, and that it will then be carried into practice. It is a matter of great importance at this period, especially when this subject is being discussed with the gravity with which it has been discussed since the Senate opened its present session, that the inhabitants of the non-slaveholding States should no longer labor under the delusion that the South will not act. I am inclined to think that the people in the North generally do not imagine that the South will take the step which has been predicted, and which it has been averred by the Senator from Alabama will be taken. One of the reasons which has induced the citizens of the non-slaveholding States to believe that the South would not carry out this determination is, that, in their opinion, it is impracticable. I think that is a great mistake. I believe that the slaveholding States of this Confederacy can establish a separate and independent government that will be impregnable to the assaults of all foreign enemies. They have the elements of power within their own boundaries, and the elements of strength in those very institutions which are supposed in the North to be their weakness. It seems that the geography of the country has not been looked to and examined. The local strength of the geographical position of the southern States has not been looked at by those who think it is impossible for them to establish and maintain a southern confederacy. I have had the curiosity to examine as to the extent of sea-board of the Atlantic States, and the mode in which it is divided, and I find, by looking at the Coast Survey, that the shore line of the northern States is only nine thousand three hundred and thirty-four miles, while that of the southern States is twenty-three thousand eight hundred and three miles. To show how this is distributed between the several States, let me present the following table:

Table showing the shore line of States on the Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico.

STATES.	Shore line of coast washed by sea.	Shore line of coast washed by bays, sounds, &c.	Shore line of rivers to the head of tide.	Sea coast and shores of bays, sounds, &c.	Sea-coast and shores of bays, sounds, and rivers to head of tide.
Maine.....	427	1,599	427	2,036	2,453
New Hampshire...	13	37	24	50	74
Massachusetts...	209	865	832	1,074	1,906
Rhode Island.....	55	153	232	208	440
Connecticut.....	14	239	1,074	253	1,327
New York.....	114	886	1,057	1,000	2,057
New Jersey.....	118	702	151	820	971
Pennsylvania.....	-	-	106	-	106
Delaware.....	29	136	506	165	671
Maryland.....	44	1,008	3,401	1,052	4,453
Virginia.....	148	735	1,690	883	2,573
North Carolina...	299	1,549	932	1,848	2,780
South Carolina...	192	356	708	548	1,256
Georgia.....	76	410	468	486	954
Florida.....	1,020	3,005	860	4,025	4,885
Alabama.....	33	284	313	317	630
Mississippi.....	42	206	137	248	385
Louisiana.....	616	1,595	936	2,211	3,147
Texas.....	353	1,284	432	1,637	2,069

The southern States have a sea-coast fitted for a commerce that they have not heretofore indulged in, because they could more profitably employ their capital in cultivating the soil. They have a vast sea-coast indented with fine harbors, and those harbors are so fortified, that if they take possession of them in advance, they can defend themselves against any enemy who may attack them.

Besides, Mr. President, it is not only practicable, but it is safe for them to do this. One of the grave charges made against the North by the Senator from Alabama, is that for twenty-five years there has been a constant system of aggression on the property of the slaveholding States, by encouraging the running away of their slaves and throwing obstructions in the way of their restitution, when not a solitary instance is brought forward to show that any portion of the people of the non-slaveholding States of this Confederacy ever attempted to give encouragement to the running away of slaves from foreign territory. We never hear of any encouragement to slaves to run away from Cuba or Brazil, although our ships are constantly in their harbors. The people of the slaveholding States believe that if they were a foreign government, that if they occupied the same relation to the non-slaveholding States of the Atlantic sea-board that Spain and Brazil do, the spirit of fanaticism that encourages their slaves to leave their masters and protects them when they get in the free States, would cease to exist. For this reason it is considered that there is safety in a separate Government, so far as the possession of their property is concerned.

There is another mistake in the North, and especially on the part of the dominant party of the North, at this time, in regard to the institutions of the South. There is a belief, probably not among the leaders of the party, but certainly among the great masses of the party, that there is a conflict between the slave and his master; that the slave hates his master, and is kept in slavery only by power and by fear. I undertake to say that that is a mistake; that the slaves of the South love their masters; that there is an affection existing in the slave population towards their masters that is entirely unknown and unappreciated in the free States. Look at the recent event at Harper's Ferry, where the slaves were ready to fight for their masters, and the moment they could, they escaped from their captors and ran back to their masters' houses for protection. That sentiment I believe to be universal among the slaves. There is a delusion in the minds of those who regard slavery as an oppression to the negro race, and hence the fatal steps that are being taken now to alienate one section of the Confederacy from the other. Not only do they not seek freedom, but it is a curse to them when they get it. Look at the free negroes, not only in our own country, but in the West Indies, as compared with the slaves of the southern States of this Union. I do not believe the negro race have ever been so happy, or have enjoyed so many privileges, or have so nearly approached civilization, at any period from the beginning of the world to the present time, as they do in the slaveholding States of this Confederacy, in a state of slavery. It is a radical mistake for the people of the North to believe, as many of them do believe, that there is any likelihood of a

conflict in the southern States, in the event of a separation, between the slave and his master. The masters would give their homes to their slaves for protection, and they, with the young men who are not capable of bearing arms, and the old men, would defend those homes, while the mass of the population would resist any attempt to infringe their rights if they established a southern confederacy, and protect this very institution. I say those slaves who could be intrusted with arms, with the old men and the boys, would protect their homes and cultivate their fields, while the men in the prime of life were fighting their enemy, if any enemy should present himself, which, I believe, will never be the case.

While this debate, on the other side of the Chamber, has been conducted somewhat guardedly, there have been sentiments uttered which are well calculated to arouse indignation, and to stir the flame that is now raging in the country. You hear it said here that in the event of the election of a Republican candidate for the Presidency, if there is any resistance, they will hang those who resist. Now, who are they going to hang? One of the Senators indicated very plainly that he intended to hang the Governors of States. How is he going to get at them? By invasion? Is it not an indication to the southern States of the Confederacy that they will be invaded, and that their Governors are to be taken and executed? Is it not a notice to the representatives of those fifteen States here, that if they dare to avow these opinions, they are to be executed too? Is that the spirit that ought to be indulged, or are those the words that ought to be used here, if you wish to preserve this Confederacy? Is it not a species of degradation to hold out to Senators representing fifteen slaveholding States, that in the event of their resisting, or any portion of their population resisting the inauguration and government of a Republican President, they are to be put to death as traitors? Is not that the very reason why they will now prepare to put themselves in such a position that this threat cannot be executed by a Republican President, by preparing for the separation of this Government, and putting themselves in such a position that they can resist? It is inviting a dissolution of the Union; and it will result in that, if this tone of remark is to be indulged in here and elsewhere.

There is another reason why the southern States should prepare, at this time, for this very event. Look at the recent elections in the non-slaveholding States. The Republican party has triumphed in almost every State—I may say every State on the Atlantic border, not on the Pacific border; and notwithstanding the Union meetings that we have heard so much of, and they are very creditable to the parties who are engaged in them, I cannot see in them anything but the expression of the opinion of the minority of those States. I cannot see, so far as my observation extends, that there has been any change in the public sentiment of the majority in those States where these meetings have been held. I notice, this morning, that in Boston, where a great Union meeting was held, last week, the Republicans have succeeded, by a large majority, in electing their mayor. I do not see any giving way in the majority that rules those States, in consequence of these Union meetings,

of which we have heard a good deal, and which are very creditable to those engaged in them. Then why should not the South be forewarned by these elections to prepare for the result? for, as the Senator from Alabama has said, there are a number of the southern States which are so pledged to resist any aggression on their rights, such as would be the election of a Republican President, that they will be disgraced and dishonored if they do not carry out their resolves. They are not the resolutions of bodies of men assembled in public meetings; they are the resolutions of the Legislatures of sovereign States.

Now, Mr. President, I undertake to say that the southern States must look this question in the face, as it has been presented by the Senator from Alabama, to-day; because the organization of the Republican party, in my judgment, looks to the conquest of the South. It is a sectional party. Are there any Republicans in fifteen States of this Confederacy? If there are any there, it is only in certain localities; and, out of those localities, it would be dangerous for them to avow their sentiments, because the people in those fifteen States believe that the utterance of those sentiments would be traitorous, and they would be punished accordingly. Therefore, I consider it nothing but the inevitable result of the principles avowed by that party that the South should be prepared for resistance, in the event of such an election. How could a Republican President carry on the Government in the southern States? Where would he get his Federal officers—his collectors of customs, his marshals, his district attorneys, his postmasters? I believe that, in a large majority of the slaveholding States, men who would accept commissions from a Republican President would be looked upon as public enemies, and they could not execute the duties that were imposed upon them by the President of the United States. How would they permit postmasters in South Carolina and Georgia and Alabama and those great slaveholding States to be the recipients of documents that might be circulated to excite servile insurrection? Sir, it is impracticable. It is impossible for a Republican President to administer this Government over the slaveholding States of the Confederacy, in my judgment.

Entertaining this opinion, I am not surprised at the declaration which has been made by the Senator from Alabama, and indicated by other Senators in this discussion, that they will not submit to such a rule; and it is because I love this Union and represent a constituency who are unanimously in favor of its preservation, that I have presented the views which I have submitted to-day. I say that a dissolution of the Union is not impossible, that it is not impracticable, and that the northern States are laboring under a delusion if they think that the southern States cannot separate from them either violently or peaceably; violently if necessary. They can take possession of all the public property within their limits, and prepare against any aggression from the non-slaveholding States, or any other Power that may choose to infringe upon what they conceive to be their rights. It is because I believe they can separate, and that they will separate in the event to which I have alluded, that I have referred to the speech of the Senator from Alabama as a warning to every man who loves this Union, that now is

the time to present the question in its true form, and that the election of a Republican President is the inevitable destruction of this Confederacy. I have believed it for a long time. I stated it long since as a matter of opinion. It is not a question in which those whom I represent are particularly interested, for we are two thousand miles away from any slaves, but I have said it is a solemn warning. I want this Union to be perpetual, to last as long as the world lasts; but no such element ought to be introduced into the administration of public affairs as will render its destruction certain. The only movement that can be made in the northern States is such as I have indicated, to appeal to the citizens of the North to labor no longer under the delusion that the southern States do not intend to act. I believe they do. I am certain that they will act. I think so, not only from my intercourse with their representatives here, but from personal intercourse with that people, and I think their representatives here are behind the public sentiment of the southern States, a large majority of them; and the danger which now environs the country is greater than it ever has been before.

I know that heretofore threats of disunion have been fulminated, but I have never believed until within the last few years that the danger was so great. I have always believed that something could divert it. Why? Because the parties that existed in the country, existed in all the States. I do not pretend to cast any odium on the Republican party, or their leaders, or their doctrines; but I say that with the view which the southern States entertain in regard to the platform of that party, as expressed by the Senator from Alabama, it is utterly impossible in the event of the success of a Republican candidate for the Presidency, that the southern States will not resist, will not break up this Government as a matter of necessity and safety. Entertaining these opinions, I think that this discussion should not have been precipitated at this particular juncture. I think that the Senator from Illinois had better have let this resolution pass without bringing up this old question of conflict in Kansas. It would have been better for him to allow the report to come from the proposed committee, and let us ascertain the public sentiment of the country upon that official report. But now, as the Senator from Illinois has introduced the Kansas question, what good can result? If the South were the aggressors in that case, have they not been conquered? If they tried to force slavery into Kansas, has not the result been that it is as ultra an abolition Territory, and is likely to be as ultra an abolition State, as any in the Confederacy? If, as in the case of Russia, when once she tried to conquer Turkey and take possession of Constantinople and was forced into a peace by the surrender of Sebastopol, the South by aggression did attempt to force slavery into Kansas, has she not been defeated in the contest, and is not Kansas now as ultra an anti-slavery community as any portion of the Confederacy? Why bring that forward now as any justification for the outrage which has been committed at Harper's Ferry upon the State of Virginia? Why bring up the question of slavery in the Territories? There is now scarcely a foot of territory where slavery can be profitably introduced in the United States. The North, the non-slaveholding States, have the

majority in both Houses of Congress, and unless there is a new acquisition of territory you may say that slavery is circumscribed at this very time, and they have the power of circumscribing it by refusing to ratify any treaty that any President might make to add territory which might be filled with a slave population; for it requires a two-thirds vote of the Senate to ratify any treaty. They have all the power. Slavery is not and will not be profitable in the present Territories of the United States, New Mexico or Utah. If it were, the people would introduce it there, because they could introduce it with safety. There is no territory now within the borders of the United States, where it can be successfully and profitably employed, as is evidenced by the fact that it has not been introduced into those Territories, and there can be no new acquisitions of territory where slavery would be profitable unless the North acquiesces.

Then why is it necessary to introduce this agitation of slavery in the Territories, and the past conflict in Kansas? What can be the object of the Senator from Illinois, unless it be to embarrass the investigation properly sought by the Senator from Virginia? I hope that Senator's amendment will be voted down, and that we shall have this investigation. I believe that the result of it will prove that there has been complicity, not of the distinguished leaders of their party, but of a numerous class who belong to that party, who are stimulated by the spirit that was justly described by the Senator from Alabama this morning, of hatred to the institutions of the South; and it will go on if they meet with success; and leaders, more moderate than they, will be set aside if they do not come up to their views in carrying on this war against the institutions of the South.

Mr. President, I want this Union to be preserved and to be made perpetual, and in order that it may be perpetual it is necessary that the Senators on the other side when appealed to, as they have been this morning, should at least give a gleam of hope to the southern States that the policy of their incoming administration, if they should succeed in electing a President, will be different from what the local policy of their States has heretofore been with reference to the institution of slavery. If not, as I stated before, I believe a separation will be inevitable.

The Senator from Illinois, the other day, asked why the South looked upon the people of the non-slaveholding States as their enemies, who wished to put the knife to the throats of their wives and children? It is because they believe the doctrines that are taught by his party lead inevitably to that result. Whether they are right or wrong, they believe it: that is the sentiment of the people of the southern States, and I believe that they intend to resist the acquisition of power in this Confederacy by his party, because they think that the election and installation of a Republican President would be their conquest. If such a President could not have collectors of customs at Charleston, Mobile, and New Orleans, and other ports, he would send his revenue cutters there with his collectors on board, to collect the revenues, and they would be in a degree blockaded. Thus the South would be blockaded; and ultimately, probably, almost without the means of defense, they would be forced into a war of bloody results; whereas, if they were to take possession of all the Govern-

ment establishments that are within the southern borders, as in my judgment they will, in the event of the election of a Republican President, before his installation, they believe that they are powerful enough to resist any attempt to infringe on the new order of government which they will have established. By waiting, they put themselves in the power of the Federal Government; but by preparing for the event in advance, they put it out of the power of any government on the face of the earth to inflict on them what they conceive to be a serious or fatal injury. This being the opinion of a vast majority of the people in the southern States of the Confederacy, I say, in the event of the success of a Republican candidate for the Presidency, the southern States, in my judgment, will pursue the course that has been shadowed out by the Senator from Alabama to-day.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I do not intend to occupy the attention of the Senate long; but, in my humble judgment, the position of affairs is presented this morning in a more distinct light than it has been before; and if the position assumed by the Senator from California—and I desire to meet this subject plainly—be true, we have been living under a delusion—an utter delusion; we are not a union of States; the free States are subject provinces, and our people do not choose a President. They but perform an idle ceremony. You sit there, according to the enunciation made this morning, the representatives of fifteen States, and you proclaim to the majority of this Union that, if they dare to exercise their prerogative and choose a President representing the views which they entertain, (and the supposition presupposes that they are the views of a majority of the people of these United States, or else they could not elect a President,) you will dissolve the Union. You substantially, by this declaration, declare that this is an idle mockery, a delusion, and a deception.

* * * * *

Is this an appeal that is made to us? It is not an appeal to us as freemen, not as the representatives of free States, not as men. If you respected us or our constituents, you could not make such an appeal. It is not an appeal to be made to men, or to freemen. It does not address itself to our reason, but to our fears. I know it has been said, sometimes, reproachfully, that the only way to appeal to us is either to address our fears or our pockets. This declaration to-day, made upon the floor of the Senate, is based upon the idea that there is nothing manly, nothing patriotic, nothing that spurns degradation, in ourselves or in the people whom we represent.

Sir, if Senators think that that is the way this difficulty is to be solved, it is not for me to complain. I thank them for the warning; and I ask them, if they feel any sort of interest to know how it is received by the people of the free States, to read the returns that will come from the next election, and ascertain how many are scared, how many are frightened, how many are driven by such an appeal, as it has been called.

* * * * *

I think, and I believe history justifies me in it—other gentlemen can speak for themselves—that I represent a people that cannot be driven. They are few; but when they were much fewer than they are now, when they were not one half in number what they are now, they left their plows in the

field, and they left their women to look after the homesteads, and they turned out from mountain and valley and bared their breasts to the invading foe, wherever and whenever he might come. Sir, I do hope in God that the day is distant, very distant, when their mettle or their courage shall be put to the test, in anything that bears even the semblance of a fraternal contest; but let me tell gentlemen that they will find in the end they are mistaken.

Mr. GWIN. Mr. President, in the few remarks which I submitted, I did not intend to say anything against the Republican party, but I desired to call the attention of that party to the remarks of the Senator from Alabama, and I observed that that Senator had spoken his true sentiments, and the sentiments of those whom he represents. They believe that the principles of the Republican party are destructive to the constitutional rights of the slaveholding States, that they can only preserve those rights by resisting the principles of that party; and if a President of that party were to be elected and installed, it would be destructive to their constitutional rights. I stated that he spoke the sentiments of his people, and that the South would act on his convictions, and break up this Government, in such an event. That was all I said: it was no threat.

Let me call the attention of the Senator from New Hampshire to the vote in the last presidential election; and how significant it was. I do not now recollect what was the popular vote of the slaveholding States; but we will assume that it was five hundred thousand. How many of those votes were cast for the Republican candidate for the Presidency? In but few of those States was there any Republican electoral ticket—I do not believe in more than one or two—and in a large majority of those States, there were not men enough who would avow the principles of that party, or who would dare avow them, to be electors. It was a purely sectional contest on their part, while on the other hand the Democratic candidate, who received the electoral vote of every slaveholding State, with one exception, received the vote of one million two hundred thousand freemen in the free States of this Confederacy. Sir, nothing is more significant than the result of the last presidential election; and the result of the State elections which have since taken place. They all show that the Republican party is a sectional party, that it has no existence in the southern States, and never can have any existence there, and that the success of a Republican candidate for the Presidency is to be achieved exclusively by the non-slaveholding States, and by the majority they have in the electoral college; and that the people of the South, regarding the principles of that party as destructive to their constitutional rights, will act on their convictions in the event of the success of a Republican presidential candidate, and the result will be the destruction of our present form of Government. That was all the statement I made. I appealed to the fears of nobody, of no section, of no party; that was not my object; but I did appeal to the judgment of those who entertain certain principles, whether it was best for them to persevere in those principles when they saw that the effect of their triumph must be the destruction of the Government. Now, I do not profess to be braver than anybody else; I certainly am not brave enough to adopt and carry out any line of

policy that would jeopardize the existence of this glorious Confederacy, and I have in a small way attested it.

In 1850, when I came here as one of the Senators selected by the people of California to present their constitution for admission as one of the sovereign States of this Confederacy, the delegation called on various gentlemen of distinguished position in the Senate and House of Representatives; and, among others, on the then illustrious Senator from Kentucky, (Mr. Clay,) and we requested him, and those other gentlemen whom I shall not name—because it was on his advice that we called on them—to favor the immediate admission of the State of California into the Confederacy. We were without any government. California had first been conquered, and then purchased from Mexico; and the United States had not even given us a territorial government. We had not a solitary civil officer of this Government within the borders of California. We were living under a purely military government, at the head of which was a colonel in the Army of the United States, who assumed and exercised all authority over that vast extent of country. We had no government of our own, except such as we were compelled to form; and, in this state of things, we adopted a State constitution, and under it we presented ourselves here as representatives of the State; and we wanted immediate admission. Mr. Clay, with others, expressed his desire that the State should be instantly admitted, and said he would exert himself for its instant admission. After this statement by him and others, I went away; I thought I had nothing further to do; I had performed my duty by presenting the matter to those who had the power. The President of the United States said the same thing; he declared that he would send in the constitution, and urge the immediate admission of the State. Thus, having no doubt of the immediate admission of California, I left this city temporarily. While I was away in New York, I found that the Senator from Kentucky had changed his position, and had gone against the immediate admission of California. I came to Washington and had an interview with him; and he told me that a number of members of the lower House of Congress, and among them, I believe, I see now before me a Senator of this body who was one of the spokesmen, had called upon him and had pledged their honor to him that they would never permit California to be admitted as a member of the Confederacy until the question of slavery in the Territories was settled; that there was a sufficient number who were determined, by resorting to the rules of the House, to prevent the passage of a bill admitting California as a State, and that they intended to prosecute their determination even to the destruction of the Government. Mr. Clay said he was thoroughly convinced of the truth of their assertion, and hence he had determined not to press the separate admission of California into the Union.

I acquiesced in that view of the Senator from Kentucky. I did not want the admission of California to cause the destruction of the Union itself, and hence I was willing to have her just rights delayed; the privileges to which she was entitled, as a portion of the Confederacy, overlooked for a time, rather than that her admission

should result in the destruction of the very Confederacy of which she sought to be a member. I was not, like the Senator from New Hampshire, brave enough to jeopardize the existence of the Government in order to accomplish an object which I knew to be right and proper, and that was the immediate admission of California as a sovereign State. I was willing to bide my time rather than to bring this injury and danger upon the country.

Further, sir, at a later period of that contest, which is familiar to many of those in this Chamber, who were then participants in it, it is well known that the conflict became more fierce, and I was called on by the President of the United States in order to make a demonstration which he suggested, to separate these questions, one from the other, to join my colleagues—the other Senator and the two Representatives from California—in signing a memorial and protest against connecting the admission of California with the other compromise measures; and he pledged himself that if I would join my colleagues in sending that protest to the two Houses of Congress, California would be admitted in a week, and I would be in my seat in the Senate. I told him of the interview I had had with the Senator from Kentucky, and said that as far as I was concerned, I would not force the question when I believed, as I then did, convinced by the experience of those older than myself, that it would jeopardize the Confederacy. I was not brave enough to seek to accomplish what I knew was immediately just and right to the State which I represented, and to press it so as to jeopardize the existence of the Union, and that is what I have indicated here to-day. I have submitted to the judgment of those who represent the Republican party, even if they think it is right, whether it is proper to press the success of a political party in this country to the point of destroying the Government. That was my suggestion. I said that I made the suggestion because I represented a constituency in favor of the preservation of the Union, although they are very remote from the seat of your Government. We revere this Union, we honor it, and we desire to preserve it. My only object in the remarks which I made, was to present to the country the idea that there is danger, and to submit whether it is not best to pause before parties get so much excited that it will be impossible to prevent a collision.

Mr. WILSON. I rise, Mr. President, for the purpose of saying a word or two in reply to the remarks which have been made by the Senator from Alabama. That Senator stated, and repeated the statement often during his speech, that the people of the North hated slavery and hated slaveholders; and he quoted remarks said to have been made by Governor Chase, and made the declaration that we of the free States concurred in that sentiment.

Mr. CLAY. The Senator does not fairly represent me. I said the Republican party; not the people of the northern States.

Mr. WILSON. Very well, sir. I did not intend to misstate the Senator. I know that he referred to the Republican party. I think there must be some mistake in the remark attributed to Governor Chase. I have known Governor Chase long and well; and if there be a man in America who does not entertain such a sentiment

as has been attributed to him, I believe he is that man. I think there must be some mistake about that matter. I have no doubt about it. I tell the Senator from Alabama that he does to us on this floor injustice, if he believes that we hate slaveholders. He does the Republicans of the free States the grossest injustice in making the declarations he has made here to-day. The Senator from Alabama may travel in every free State of this Union, and he will be received with the kindness and the courtesy that the people extend to any of us on this side of the Chamber.

Mr. CLAY. Not if I carried my slave with me; because, by the laws of your State, of New Hampshire, and of Michigan, I should incur the perils of a felon if I carried my slave to any of those States and sought to hold him there.

Mr. WILSON. The Senator from Alabama has no right to carry his slaves into a free State; and the moment he takes them there, they become as free as himself. Now, sir, I say that the Senator may go into Faneuil Hall, he may go into Tremont Temple, he may go into any gathering of the Republicans of Massachusetts, and he will be treated with the kindness and the courtesy that should be extended to a Senator of the United States.

* * * * *

But, sir, being up, I wish to say a word in regard to the remarks which have just been made with reference to the dissolution of this Union in a certain event. I wish to say to Senators that these declarations that the Union of these States is to be dissolved if the people of this country choose to elect a Republican President, are received in the free States, as they should be received, with the sternest condemnation; and that the declarations made in this House and in the other during the last few days, have aroused not a poor, miserable, cowardly spirit of servility, but a manly spirit in our people, a determination to exercise their constitutional rights, and express their opinions freely through the ballot-box.

Senators have referred to Union-saving meetings, and they judge of those meetings rightly. They are of no earthly significance, and no attempt here, in Washington, to get up a crisis can make them of significance. A Union-saving meeting was recently held in my State, and we are told to-day that we have elected a Republican city government in the city of Boston, following immediately after that meeting. Well, sir, that meeting was enough to make the people of Boston elect a Republican city government. I have not a word to say against the very respectable gentlemen who took part in that meeting, nor in regard to the political leaders who get up these Union-saving meetings; but I say to the Senate and to the country, that the meeting in the city of Boston does not weigh a feather's weight in my State. I put myself on the record to-day, and I declare that, notwithstanding the threats of a dissolution of the Union in certain contingencies, the people of Massachusetts will give fifty thousand solid majority for whoever may be nominated as the Republican candidate for the Presidency. Gentlemen must not imagine that we are to be influenced by any attempt to frighten us, or to get up a crisis, or to appeal to the conservative sentiment of the North. Why, sir, the conservative sentiment is with us, the property is with us, the intelligence is with us, the personal character is

with us, in the free States, and the patriotism is with us—that patriotism which under no circumstances ever threatens to dissolve the Union—that patriotism which will stand by the national Government in any emergency in upholding the Union of these States and the perpetuity of the just rights of the States and of the people.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. President, I shall not consume the time of the Senate in replying to what has fallen from the Senator from Massachusetts. I furnished proof of the truth of my position of the hatred of his party to slaveholders as well as slaveholding. I stated that his colleague had avowed more than that, in alluding to the “slaveholding oligarchy of the South,” though I did not consume the time of the Senate by reading it; and his people have indorsed those sentiments by his reelection. He denounced slavery as the sum of all villainies; and he slaveholders as—

“Base, false, and heedless of justice. It is vain to expect that men who have screwed themselves up to become the propagandists of this enormity will be restrained by any compromise, compact, bargain, or pledged faith. As the less is contained in the greater, so there is no villeness of dishonesty, no denial of human rights, that is not plainly involved in the support of an institution which begins by changing man, created in the image of God, into a chattel, and sweeps little children away to the auction block.”

Can any terms of hatred, of abhorrence, of utter loathing and contempt for the people of the southern States, those who you declare are the ruling power there, be expressed in the English language? Are not these expressions of hatred as bitter, as intense as could possibly be uttered? Yet they are indorsed by your people. You cannot possibly affect to have any regard or any respect for our constitutional rights when we cannot recover a fugitive slave within your limits, except by stratagem or by force. I have heard upon this floor, and that Senator has heard, expressions of joy and triumph at the fact that the recovery of Anthony Burns cost \$30,000. You, by your legislation, have avowed your hatred of slaveholders and slaveholding to such an extent that you not only nullify and abjure a solemn obligation of the Federal Constitution, which you once respected and enforced, but you punish your own citizens who attempt to enforce that law.

The same thing is done in the State of New Hampshire; and yet, you Senators rise in your places and complain of these imputations of hatred to our constituencies, and reproach us for declaring that we are not willing to live under a Government administered by you; reproach us with a want of love of this Union; with a want of fealty to its obligation; and, at the same time, arrogate the right to violate our constitutional rights with impunity. Do you think that we will endure the burdens of this Government while you deny us its benefits? Do you think that we are prepared to keep the bonds of the Constitution when you violate them? Do you think that while, by your legislation, you countenance and encourage depredations upon our property, we can regard you as friends, or that we can servilely submit to such abuses of our rights? If you do, you must think us gifted with some of that God-like charity and forbearance and long-sufferance which, when smitten on one cheek, would turn the other to the assailant; or, you must think us unworthy of the freedom which was purchased by the blood of our sires as well as yours.

I made no menaces; did not threaten the North with compulsion; did not threaten to force the North to any issue or any position; but I showed that your party was solemnly pledged, by your platform and by the avowals of your leaders throughout the northern States, to maintain and carry out in the administration of this Government, when you get the power, measures which we regard as an infraction of our constitutional rights; and not only that, measures which you yourself have forewarned us are intended to destroy a domestic institution upon which our social and political organization is based; measures which tend to revolutionize our society, to deluge our land in blood, and to desolate our fair fields; and yet you complain of an intent and purpose on our part to alarm the northern people, and scare them into acquiescence to our terms of government! What new terms have I proposed—what other terms than are found in the Constitution, the bond of union? None whatever. You avow here on this floor your purpose to violate this bond; and turn round, with seeming railery and mockery, and complain of us because we say that when you have broken this bond we will cease to maintain it, and refuse to become mere subjugated provinces of a Government which denies us our equality—denies us the rights which you have pledged yourselves to observe and maintain.

The Senator himself has time and again avowed sentiments, not in express terms declaring his hatred of slaveholders, but tantamount, in my opinion, to such a declaration. I have not troubled myself to search his record, but if this debate is continued, I think I shall present him with some evidence of this assertion. I know one thing, that he has pledged himself to labor for the emancipation of the three and a half or four million slaves in my country; he has declared himself for immediate and unconditional emancipation; and he has joined hands with Wendell Phillips in the achievement of that end. Why, then, should he display any sensitiveness when I impute to his party, and to him, hatred of slaveholders, and a purpose to exterminate that institution in our midst? Ay, sir, how can Senators on the other side profess not to hate slaveholders, when they profess to regard them as criminals, violators of the laws of God, and of the rights of humanity? How can they affect any other than aversion or dislike, which are the synonyms of hatred, toward those whom they denounce as barbarous, as savage, as ferocious, as guilty of unchristian and uncivilized practices; and that is the plain import of your own platform. It is upon its very face a libel upon the institutions of fifteen States of this Union, and upon the dominant power, as you declare, within those States, unless, forsooth, we are as base and as degraded and depraved as you insinuate.

I have not endeavored to increase the excitement to which the Senator has been pleased to allude. God knows that I have a higher purpose to serve here than that of party or myself. I have nothing to desire and nothing to attain beyond the high position which I here occupy as an ambassador of a sovereign State. I seek no more of my constituency. I never have sought, and never expect to seek, other honors at the hands of any other people or person than my own constituency. I have no motive to achieve, either, in

producing excitement in our midst. We, it is true, have been exasperated to a degree which has been unprecedented hitherto in the history of this country. We have seen principles and sentiments avowed by the dominant party in the northern section of the Union, culminating in treason and civil war. We have cause for exasperation; but the menaces came from your side, and from your party. We were menaced with compulsory submission to your authority; we were insulted with the threat of the hangman and the rope; and it was in reply to these grossly insulting remarks that I spoke with calmness, with respect, towards you, and explained the ground upon which we planted ourselves. I forbore even to pledge my State to separation. I forbore to promise or predict what she would do. I only spoke of what was due, in my opinion, to her own honor, to her own welfare, to her own sovereignty within the Union.

I had not intended to do so, but since the remarks which have fallen from the other side, I will go further and invoke the attention of the Senate and the country to a further proof of this hatred, or, if you prefer a milder word, this aversion or dislike of slaveholders, as well as of slaveholding. I shall quote a remark from a Senator, who certainly stands at the head and front of the northern Republican party of this Union, and is entitled to that preëminence by his superior abilities, his superior attainments, and his superior services to that party—a Senator the bare mention of whose name by the Senator from Massachusetts, (if the newspaper press of the day did not misrepresent,) in the Republican convention at Philadelphia, was greeted with such a testimony of reverence on the part of that assemblage as has been accorded to no other man within my knowledge in his day and time; for the papers report that the whole assemblage rose spontaneously and simultaneously to their feet and greeted the mention of his name with deafening applause—a Senator who has been hitherto the leader of his party in all their measures of oppressive policy towards the South; and I say that I have reason to believe that he spoke the sentiment of the great Republican party—I mean great in numbers—because he has been thus honored by them, and because since he uttered the remarks which I shall read, he has been reëlected to the Senate of the United States. Of course I mean Mr. SEWARD. The Senator from New York, in 1855, speaking of the many bonds of the Union upon the North, said:

“The slaveholders, in spite of all their threats, are bound to it by the same bonds; and they are bound to it also by a bond peculiarly their own—that of dependence on it for their own safety. Three million slaves are a hostile force constantly in their presence, in their very midst. The servile war is always the most fearful form of war. The world without sympathize with the servile enemy.”

Now, I submit, if that monster, John Brown, had achieved his purpose, and had succeeded in arming fifteen hundred or two thousand slaves in Virginia with the murderous weapon which was prepared in New England for their use, and we had witnessed a bloody insurrection in this country, should I be doing great wrong, great injustice, to the distinguished Senator from New York if I charged that he sympathized with this servile foe, that he approved this insurrection? I answer in his own language to such a charge, “The world

without sympathizes with the servile foe;” and why? Because I presume that the Senator from New York, speaking for his party, regards us, as expressed in your platform, as violators of the rights of humanity, and criminal in the eyes of God and of all Christian men.

Mr. President, I am not prepared to allege that all the members of the Republican party, or that all the Republican Senators upon this floor, are ready to indorse this sentiment of the Senator from New York; I am not prepared to say that all of them hate slaveholders; but what I say is, that it is the predominant sentiment of the party which they represent. I censure them for not condemning that sentiment in their midst; ay, for having encouraged it by the principles they avow, and the sentiments they profess. They have themselves invoked a spirit in their midst which is “subtler than brute force and mightier than armed men.” They have themselves created a storm upon which they may ride to power, but which they cannot then control. We hear the low mutterings of its ominous thunder, and sometimes see the fitful gleams of its baleful lightning; and, sir, if no higher purpose could animate us, the mere brute instinct of self-preservation would impel us to prepare for the conflict, and the defense of our rights against that power which threatens their destruction—and which, so far as State legislation can, has destroyed them—by, if necessary, armed resistance.

I speak, sir, as an American Senator, as an ambassador from a sovereign and coëqual State of this Union, with a due sense of my responsibilities to the people of my State, and to the Union—ay, of my responsibilities to myself. I have spoken, and will speak, in no terms of menace. I will not venture even to predict what my people will do. I only avow what I believe their honor, their love of independence, and their love of existence itself will justify and require of them. I know how you have been accustomed to treat all intimations of a purpose or a power, under any circumstances of oppression, however grievous, to separate, to secede, and establish an independent government on the part of the South. I know the Senator, who sits on your right, [Mr. WADE,] has laughed to scorn the idea of the southern people having the power or the will to resist the North, and to maintain their independence out of the Union. I know that he indulged in every expression of contempt for our weakness, and of hatred of our crimes, and ended by declaring that any member of such a partnership would kick such a partner out.

Sir, I do not choose to protract this discussion. I trust that I have said enough, and shown enough this morning to justify me in the positions I have taken. I have shown that by the non-action of all and by the legislation of some seven States in the northern part of this Confederacy—I have not prosecuted my inquiries long enough to ascertain whether there are others—a solemn obligation of the Federal Constitution for the restoration of fugitive slaves has been nullified, and that they have gone further in some of the States, and punished criminally the carrying of a slave into them. I have appealed to Senators to know whether they condemned this legislation; whether they were willing to keep that part of the covenant which our fathers made; whether if there were no legis-

lation by Congress on the subject, they would themselves adjure their party to enact laws to secure the rendition of fugitive slaves. I have asked them whether in case a vessel filled with slaves, launched from the port of Charleston, on its way to Galveston in the State of Texas, was seized by any foreign Power, and our property confiscated, they would be willing to exert all the powers of this Government, either for its recovery, or for our remuneration; and whether they would merely claim through the representative of our Government in any such foreign court, of a Power that had thus abused our rights, any remuneration. I paused for a reply to all these questions. I asked them without passion, and in no offensive terms. Silence, silence, was the only response to all these interrogatories. I told you that I should construe your silence into an approbation of these acts nul-

lifying the fugitive slave act, and you suffered me so to interpret it thereafter.

Then the alternative presented to the South by your party, if you get the power, is that we must secede, or we must continue to pay taxes, to perform military duty, to endure all the burdens of this Government, while you disregard and violate some of the solemn obligations which were intended for our benefit whenever the occasion arises; that we are to stand in the Union as subjects really, and not as free citizens; that we are to stand in it as outlaws, who dare not pass the limits of the slaveholding States with our property, at the peril of its loss and even of our own personal liberty. If you think that this is just, that it is constitutional, that it is fraternal, it is impossible for us to harmonize, it is impossible for us to live under a Government administered by your party.



1875
August 7

1875

x

1875

1875

Boston Public Library
Central Library, Copley Square

Division of
Reference and Research Services

The Date Due Card in the pocket indicates the date on or before which this book should be returned to the Library.

Please do not remove cards from this pocket.

